### INDEX

Of

# WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
TAKEDA, Isamu (resumed)	21282
Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr (cont	'd) 21282
MORNING RECESS	21302
Cross by Mr. Comyns Carr (cont	21303
Redirect by Mr. Roberts	21320
NOON RECESS	21324
Redirect by Mr. Roberts (cont'	d) 21326
(Witnes	ss excused)21335
AOKI, Takeshi	21362
Direct by Mr. Roberts	21362
(Witnes	ss excused) 21366
TOTSUKA, Michitare	21373
Direct by Mr. Roberts	21373
(Witnes	ss excused) 21377

# INDEX

of .

# STITLEXA

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description Ident. Ex	In ridence
7.2	2519		A heply of the Minister for Foreign Affeirs to the British Ambassador dated 9	21337
	1529		September 1937	21337
73	2520		Note of the British Ambassedor to the Minister for Fereign	
	2323		Affairs dated 23 September 193	21349
136	2521		Note of the Tapanese Government to the	
1101			U. S. Government dated 14 December 1937	21345
85	2522		Note of the Japanese G vernment to the Government of the U. S. dated 24 December 1937 re the	21250
			Panay Incident	21350
			AFTERNOON RECESS	21352
8-	2523		Note of the Government of the U.S. to the Japanese Government dated 26 December 1937 re the Paney Incident	21353
13.96	2524		Statement of the Foreign Office dated 23 March 1928	21358

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

No.	Def.	Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
401(21)	2525		"Panay" Incident		21360
1291	2526		Affidavit of AOKI, Take	shi	21363
1039	2527		The Official Note of the Japanese Government which the Foreign Minister HIROTA, Kolsent to Sir Robert Craigie 14 December	c1	21367
1013	2528		Certificate on "Ladybin Incident	rd"	21371
1076	2529		Affidavit of TOTSUKA,		21373

#### Friday, 2 May 1947 2 3 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 6 7 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 8 at 0930. 9 10 Appearances: 11 For the Tribural, same as before with the 12 exception of: THE HONORABLE MR. JUSTICE NORTHCROFT, 13 not sitting. 14 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 15 For the Defense Section, same as before. 16 17 (English to Japanese and Japanese 18 to English interpretation was made by the 19 Language Section, IMTFE.) 20 21 22 23

24

Spratt & Yelde

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except the accused TOGO who is represented by counsel. The prison surgeon at Sugamo certifies that the accused TOGO is too ill to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

It is requested on behalf of the Language Division that all documents, including running commentaries of counsel, be presented to the Language Division forty-eight hours in advance in order to insure simultaneous interpretation, and that the Language Division be notified in advance of any deviations from the planned order or presentation.

The court reporting section requires from the defense a copy of running commentary of counsel and an accurate order of proof for each subdivision of their case twenty-four hours prior to use in court. Both the Clerk of the Court and the Marshal require an accurate order of proof for each subdivision of the case twenty-four hours in advance of presentation in court. In addition thereto they require to be furnished at the same time with a complete list of witnesses with the document number of their affidavit opposite their names.

The Clerk of the Court also requires where a defense document is to be presented as an excerpt from a basic document which is on deposit in the Clerk's office but not yet marked for identification that the number of the said basic document be indicated on the order of proof. In lieu thereof this data may be supplied to the Clerk on a separate memorandum.

The Member from China has drawn my attention to an article in the Stars and Stripes headed "China Negligence Brought War." He complains that the article contains a number of sweeping and inaccurate statements against the Chinese not warranted by the evidence. This appears to be so as a reference to the record will show.

Mr. Comyns Carr.

----

ISAMU TAKEDA, called as a witness on
behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and
testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. COMYNS CARR (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, last evening I was asking you about the account you gave of this alleged murder of Lieutenant OYAMA. Let me be sure if I have got your

story right. Do you say that on the evening of the 9th of August your subordinate officer went to the aerodrome and found on his first visit two Japanese bodies and no other?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And that he then paid a second visit. Was that on the same evening?

A Because of the crying need for preparations and for assembling the responsible persons from both the concerned powers as well as the journalists from third powers some time elapsed and the second visit took place at about midnight of the same evening--after midnight.

THE MONITOR: I believe it was after midnight when they finally went there the second time.

Q Do you say then that on that second visit representatives of China and Japan and of the newspapers went with him?

A The second in command, YAMANOUCHI -- assistant staff officer YAMANOUCHI; yes, that is so.

Q And that they then found only two bodies, one of them being that of OYAMA and the other being that of a Chinese guard?

A Yes, that is so; and in addition the body of the chauffeur was found about five hundred yards

3

5

7

6

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

18

19

21

22

24

2

5

6

9

11

13

16

15

17

20

19

23

24 25 away at the entrance to the village.

Q Is it your suggestion that meanwhile the Chinese guards had shot one of their number and put him by the side of Lieutenant OYAMA?

A Yes, that is so.

Q And as I understood you to say yesterday that they had shot him with a rifle in order to prove that Lieutenant OYAMA had shot him with a revolver?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: I object because it is assuming a state of facts which were not stated in that manner.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness may not have said it but he did suggest it.

MR. ROBERTS: The record will show he said as a result of an autopsy it was revealed that he was shot by a rifle bullet.

Q Is that your suggestion that they had shot him with a rifle in order to prove that Lieutenant OYAMA had shot him with a revolver?

A I don't understand the translation of that question -- I don't understand the question because of the translation.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Will the Language Division try again--

THE PRESIDENT: How does he know it is the translation that is at fault? You cannot know that a question is wrongly translated unless you know the question.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to add that I do not believe the question in English is clear.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think your view

is shared by anybody on the Bench, Mr. Roberts.

The Japanese reporter had better repeat the question to see what results.

Are you still in doubt, Witness?

THE WITNESS: May I repeat what I said yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT: Answer the question if you can, if you understand it. If you do not, say so.

THE WITNESS: I do not understand, clearly understand, the purport of the question. I don't know what the prosecutor is trying -- is driving at; what answer he expects of me.

THE PRESIDENT: As long as you understand the question you are not concerned with what he is driving at or what he expects.

THE WITNESS: I do not have such a feeling. I do not feel that way.

THE PRESIDENT: I think the English reporter

had better repeat the question, please, so that it may be translated again.

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the official court reporter as follows:)

Q Is that your suggestion that they had shot him with a rifle in order to prove that Lieutenant OYAMA had shot him with a revolver?

A The Chinese trick became clear after this event, after the autopsy.

THE PRESIDENT: That is enough, Mr. Carr. He said it was a Chinese trick.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"hen did the autopsy take place? Q In the morning or about noon the following day. "hen did you get the report of it? The military surgeon immediately brought the report to me after the autopsy. Who did? The military surgeon, the surgeon of the -medical officer of the naval landing party. I see. So the autopsy was conducted by the naval landing party, was it? The autopsy took place at Chenju University in the presence of medical officers both from the Chinese side and from the Japanese naval landing party. And do you still say that the Chinese admitted that this story of yours is true? Yes, I still believe so. Who on behalf of the Chinese? The medical officers who took part in the autopsy discovered that it was not so; that there was a discrepancy in the bullets. Yes, but you know that is not what I was

asking you. What you swore in your affidavit was

that the Chinese Chief of Staff admitted this fact,

that is, the whole story about the shooting of OYAMA?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Carr, was that in paragraph eight, sir, end of paragraph 8 or 9?

MR. COMYNS CARR: End of eight.

A Yes, that is so.

Q Did you say that the Chief of Staff did admit it?

A Yes.

Q You know that you told me yesterday that it wasn't the Chief of Staff but some minor officer, and that all he said was that when he brought the bodies of the two men and delivered them to you he expressed his regret. Which is true?

A They are all true. If necessary I shall explain my statement.

Q I asked you yesterday who was the Chief of Staff. You said you couldn't tell me. Then I asked you who made this statement, and you said it was the junior officer who brought the bodies. You described him as the senior adjutant. He would be junior to the Chief of Staff, would he not?

A' Yes, that is, of course, so. The Chief of Staff was at the time a Major General, and the Chinese representative who handled this case and who

4 5

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

was constantly in touch with Staff Officer YAMA-NOUCHI was a Ligutement Colonel and the Senior Adjutant.

Q Now then, you state that the investigation was also conducted by third party national newspaper men.

A Since this was a very important matter we thought it would be a good thing to take along neutral representatives.

Yes. And I was asking you whether one of them was the representative of the North China Daily News?

A Since I do not understand European languages very well I am not aware of the names of the various foreign papers, but I do know that representatives of all the most important foreign newspapers were there.

Q Don't you know that the North China Daily News is one of the most important, if not the most important, foreign newspaper in Shanghai?

Yes, I would think it was an important newspaper, the ones the names of which I knew.

Q And was their representative there?

A A newspaper man? You mean newspaper man, a reporter?

2

3

4

5

6

7

A newspaper man from the newspaper? A Yesterday I was looking over old newspapers, and I saw a photograph showing foreign newspaper men standing on the spot. Q Do you mind answering my question? Was the representative of the North China Daily News there? Yes, I think, of course, a representa-8 tive of that paper was there. 9 Do you suggest that they agreed to the 10 truth of the story you have been telling us? 11 A Yes, as a matter of fact they did agree, 12 all of them did agree. 13 Q Do you know that Mr. John B. Powell, 14 who gave evidence before this Tribunal, was the 15 editor of that newspaper? 16 A No, I am not aware of that -- no, I did 17 not know. 18 19 21

20

22

23

24

Morse & Greenberg

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

Q I suggest to you that all that was ever established with regard to this natter was this; that evening an officer and a sailor of the Japanese Navy were shot and killed as they were trying to enter the Chinese airdrome at Hungjao.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: Might I object to the giving of testimony by the prosecutor as to his version of what happened?

THE PRESIDENT: He is entitled to put his evidence to the witness. If he intended to make a mere statement he was wrong in so doing. But was he? Did he so intend? He didn't finish what he was going to say when you interrupted.

Will the English reporter please repeat what Mr. Comyns Carr said?

(Whereupon, the last question was read by the official court reporter.)

MR. ROBERTS: It appeared to me that the prosecutor was reading from a document of which we do not know the nature and that he was attempting to make this a part of the proof.

THE PRESIDENT: He can but his evidence to the witness whether he reads it or not as you know and as the defense frequently do. It isn't evidence

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unless it has been already established or is established or is accepted by the witness. We know this. We know that Mr. Carr doesn't give evidence. Please don't remind us so often.

MR. ROBERTS: The remarks did not have the form of a question. It seemed to me to be more in the form of a narration.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am surprised that my
learned friend should say that I was reading from a
document of which he does not know the nature because
the document which was in front of him was one served
upon us by the defense themselves but which they haven't,
so far, seen fit to offer in ewidence.

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps the reason why we felt we could not offer it was a good reason, and there is not justification for the prosecution offering it in any event.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I will now complete my question. Lenguage Division, I read down to the words on the outskirts of Shanghal."

THE MONITOR: What document is this, sir?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Shall I begin again or will you carry on from there?

THE MONITOR: "het document.

MR. COMYNS CARR: It isn't any document which

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

you have, but I was framing a question. Shall I begin again?

THE MONITOR: No, sir; it isn't necessary.

Q (Continuing) I spoke down to the words "airdrome at Hungjao on the outskirts of Shanghai, and the Chinese guard at the airdrome was also killed."

Is it not the fact that that was all that was ever established about this matter?

A No, that isn't so.

Q Now did you tell this story that you have told us to Mr. OKAMOTO, the consul-general?

A Yes, of course I told the consul-general. From that time I have always kept in constant -- I have been in contact with him constantly.

Q You were present at the meeting of the joint committee on the 12th of August, were you not?

A Yes. Is that all concerning the OYAMA case because I should like to add something to my statement.

Q Were you surprised to find that Mr. OKAMOTO did not say a word about these admissions having been made or this story of yours at all at that meeting?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Carr, "these admissions having been made." You mean admissions by the Chinese?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes.

A No, I wasn't surprised.

23

25

THE MONITOR: I wasn't surprised particularly.

Q Did you say anything about it yourself?

A No. The committee had to handle far more important matters than the OYAMA matter -- OYAMA case.

THE MONITOR: For more important and imminent matters.

Q But the OYAMA case, according to you, and so far we can agree, was the foundation of the whole of this outbreak in Shanghai, was not it?

A There are other fundamental causes of this outbreak.

THE MONITOR: The fundamental cause or the cause of this outbreak lies elsewhere in something more fundamental. The cause of the outbreak lies elsewhere in something more fundamental.

Q Now would you mind telling me what right or business Lieubenant OYAMA had to be anywhere near this airdrome on this night?

Let me explain so that it can be well understood. The guarding of the eastern -- of the western side of Shanghai was the responsibility of the English troops -- British troops. However, in this sector there were many Japanese interests, for instance, the Naigai Cotton Spinning Mill and other Japanese enterprises, as well as a great number of Japanese

-

residents. In accordance with the agreement made at the defense council -- at the defense committee -- Shanghai defense committee, a Japanese naval landing party consisting of about a hundred members were dispatched -- were stationed in this western sector. There were Japanese interests along the driveway, along the Extension Road.

THE MONITOR: There were many Japanese interests along the driveway of this Extension Road upon which this incident occurred.

A (Continuing) Lieutenant OYA A, being commanding officer of this unit, was responsible for seeing that all -- responsible for being on guard and knowing what was going on in his section. Especially at that time there were acts of terrorism at various places, and the commanding officer of the Japanese naval landing force -- landing unit -- had an extremely important responsibility of protecting the Japanese residents.

THE MONITOR: "The commander of the Japanese naval larding parties" corrected to "the commander of the unit." In other words, Lieutenant OYAMA.

A (Continuing) So that Lieutenant OYAMA was merely conducting an inspection of the sector allotted to him.

THE MONITOR: Just as he always did.

THE PRESIDENT: It seems to me the monitor is telling the interpreter what to say. The monitor's duty is to correct the interpreter if he goes wrong.

"e might as well have no interpreter but just the monitor. "e might save time if we had that arrangement, too.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Is not this airdrone in what you call the prohibited zone?

A The airdrore was situated at the place -on the other side of the Soochow River; and so,
according to the wording of it -- according to the
actual wording of the agreement, it cannot be said
to be actually in the prohibited zone. However, in
order to avoid fighting around -- in and around
Shanghai, the Chinese had stationed troops in this
area; and until about July 1932 there were hardly
any Chinese troops in this area at all.

Q But what business had Japanese armed ren there?

A There were no Japanese troops in that area at that spot.

Q What was Lieutenant OYAMA?

A Lieutenent OYAMA was conducting an inspection of the sector ellotted to him.

Q But what do you rean allotting to him a sector of what you've called the prohibited zone?

A Lieutenent OYAMA did not go outside of the Extension Road. He kept to the Extension Road.

O Well, now, you have referred to the foreign press. Did you see this account in the North China Deily News on the 10th of August?

No; I did not read the paper, so I did not know.

Q Then let re put my question another way.

Q Then let re put my question another way. Was this a fact: When the parties, as you've described, were out there at midnight on the 9th, did the foreign residents in the neighborhood of the shooting state that the two Japanese were in uniform and the chauffeur was wearing a steel helpot? Was that a fact?

"two Japanese were in uniform and the chauffeur was wearing a steel helmet," are we to take it that there were three altogether, or do you mean one of ther was a chauffeur?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Two. One of them was the chauffeur with the steel helmet.

A Yes. What they were at that time was probably so.

O Is it a fect that on previous days parties of Japanese had visited the mirdrome and been turned back by the Chinese?

A No, that is not so, and nothing like that could have happened.

O So much so that the Chinese had to send up an airplane to spot them as they were hiding in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

the fields nearby?

A No, that is not so; that is absolutely not so.

And, elthough you were interested in the foreign press, you didn't read enything about that in the North China Daily News?

A No. The reason why we took representatives of the foreign power press was because we thought it would be better if they were shown -shown what had taken place, and because we considered that it was an important thing to do. So, the representatives of all the more important papers were taken slong.

Q But you didn't trouble to find out what they said after they had been shown, did you?

A The staff officer in charge of press offeirs actually must have read the article. But, since I was so busy, I had no tire to read the foreign press.

Now, when the first report come in of this shooting, before you sent out your assistant, 22 did it come to you from the Japanese naval attache?

A Although it may take some time, I should 24 like to explain the actual circumstances.

n Answer the question first.

A The first report we had of this affair came from the Chinese side. The mayor of the city telephoned to Consul-General OKAMOTO. That is what I believe. The telephone call said that west of Shanghai there was fighting going on between Chinese and Japanese troops, and the mayor asked that the hostilities be suspended -- be stopped.

Consul-General OKAMOTO passed this information on to re. To this I answered that another big demonstration had probably started -- that another rumor had been started, so, therefore, that nothing like that could have happened and to ignore the telephone call.

O Is that what you said in fact: that nothing of the kind could have happened because no officer or man of the navel landing party had any orders to go out on that evening?

A No, that isn't so. No. What I said was that there was no fighting going on between Chinese and Japanese troops; that there were no Japanese troops in that area. There was a second call from Consul-General OKAMOTO to the same effect.

I again told Consul-General OKAMOTO that he should not be fooled by such a rumor.

Upon being called by telephone for the

3

4

6

7

8

>

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19.

20

21

22

23

24

third time, I then told Consul-General OKAMOTO
that "If you are so worried about the case, then
let us go and make an investigation on the spot -that both Japanese and Chinese representatives
should go to the spot for investigation." Contact
was made with the Chinese forces, and a staff
officer was sent out to the spot. That was when
we first were -- became aware of the incident.
Staff officers from both sides were sent out to
the spot.

Q Now, is it true that within thirty-six hours of this incident happening, thirty additional Japanese warships appeared in the river off Shanghai?

A No. I am not aware of that.

Q How reny do you say?

A Since I was in the landing party, I was -I did not know very much about what was happening
on sea.

O Did you know that, on the settlement waterfront on the 11th of August, there were a large party, approximately four thousand men, being landed from ships which had just arrived in the harbor?

A After the OYAMA incident, about one

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

thousand members of the landing party were sent from Japan to Shanghai. But that took place on the day following the incident or, perhaps, the day after that.

O Do you know that by noon on August the 11th, the cruiser IZUMO, two destroyers and nine gunboats, and twenty-eight ships in all, were tied up -- Japanese warships -- were tied up at buoys and wharves in the river?

Since the IZUMO was the flagship, and there were other Japanese neval vessels in the Yangtze, that ray have been so. But I am not sure of the number.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, efter which the proceedings were resured as follows:)

19 20

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23 24

Goldberg & Kapleau

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

of the Japanese Third Fleet?

A Yes.

On the afternoon of the 10th of August were there four cruisers and two destroyers which arrived in the harbor? I can give you the names of the cruisers, if you like.

A Since I was connected with the navel landing party, I was not -- I did not know very much of what happened at sea.

You mean that you can't answer whether these ships -- I will give the names: <u>Sendai</u>, <u>Natori</u>, <u>Yura</u>, and the <u>Kinu</u>.

Are you telling us that you don't know whether they arrived or whether they didn't?

A Yes, that is so. Since I was in the naval landing party, I didn't know.

O Did five more ships arrive in the harbor on the night of the 10th?

A I don't know.

20

21

22

23

24

.25

O Did an aircraft carrier and more warships anchor off Woosung that night?

For the same reasons, I don't know very well.

On the afternoon of the 11th did you go to the O.S.K. Vangtzepoo wharf?

A No, I don't think I went to such a place at such a time.

o Were you interested in the reinforcements and ammunition which were coming for your landing party?

A I did know that there were one thousand reinforcements, but as senior staff officer I did not
go -- A senior staff officer does not go to the
wharf every time to see what is happening.

O Did you see the lorries arriving at your landing party headquarters continuously to and fro from the wharf all that afternoon with ammunition?

A No, I am not aware of such minor details.

But where were you if you weren't at the headquarters or at the wharf or anywhere where you could see either the lorries or the fleet?

A I was in the headquarters.

And you didn't see the lorries coming in?

A No, I don't know how many trucks came,

because I was always on the move.

o on the morning --

THE MONITOR: Fold it.

Since a great many lorries were going to and fro, I could not keep account of them.

THE PRESIDENT: It isn't what he saw that matters but what he knew or did not know. You would think that he, as chief of staff, would know all those things, although he might not see lorries or ammunition or reinforcements, that is to say, if those things happened, and we make no assumption from the cross-examination apart from admissions by the witness.

THE WITNESS: Out of one thousand reinforcements five hundred were sent to the Shanghai East End Kunda Textile Mill, and the other five hundred were sent to the North Primary School.

on would it be correct to describe the assembly of Japanese warships in the harbor at Shanghai on the afternoon of the 11th of August as one of the most imposing displays of neval might Shanghai has ever seen?

A you are at liberty to describe it as you will, but according to my recollection, there was no such great assembly of Japanese vessels.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: I suppose, I'r. Carr, we can assume that you will prove, or attempt to prove, these things you are putting to the witness so far as they are not already in evidence and so far as they are not admitted by him.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Fonor.

THE PRESIDENT: I refer merely to the concentration of men, material, and ships at Shang-hai at the time.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor.

- o On the morning of the 12th of August did your press officer inform you that all the matters I have been putting to you about ships, reinforcements, and ammunition had appeared in the North China Daily News that morning and purported to be the actual observation, in the main, of one of their staff?
  - A No, I have no recollection of that.
- o Tell me, when were the orders given for the additional fleet to come to Shanghai?
  - A I don't know.
  - c Did you ask for them to be sent?
  - A No, I did not.
- naval attache in Shanghai ask for them to be sent?

A No, the commanding officer did not do so,

their own idea, did they?

3

1

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

16

115

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

and the naval attache did not have any such authority.

O So, according to you, they arrived just on

A I don't know whether such a great fleet came or not, but in any case, the movements of a fleet would be on instruction from superiors and we would know nothing of such affairs.

O But you tell us definitely that the naval authorities in Shanghai did not ask for it to be sent?

A "hat was that? Concerning the movements of the fleet, being in the naval landing party, we knew nothing about it.

Now, you were present at the meeting of the Commission on the 12th of August

A Yes.

Did you hear Mr. Yui, the Mayor, say this? I am going to read from exhibit 2516, defense document 1063, the last paragraph on page 4 and part of page 5.

THE MONITOR: Just a minute. Is that from "rejoining Mr. Yui"?

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is right. It is the reply of Mr. Yui to a speech of Mr. OKAMOTO,

.

(Reading): "Rejoining Mr. Yui stated that the Chinese delegates were not a whit behind their Japanese friends in their desire to maintain peace and goof order in Shanghai, but he submitted that peace and good order could be maintained only through sincere cooperation on the part both of China and of Japan. He would like to clarify one point raised by his Japanese colleague, who had just mentioned that the Chinese delegate had assured him only last night that the Pacantui would be withdrawn from areas close to Japanese residents. He would point out that the Chinese Civil Delegate had not made such a statement, but that he, as Mayor of Greater Shanghai had an interview with the Japanese Consul-General last night, when the latter had asked for the withdrawal of the Pacantui.

"He (the Mayor) had then raised the question of the reported arrival of heavy Japanese naval reinforce. ents outside Woosung, whereupon the Japanese Consul-General had expressed surprise and uttered the remark that he didn't know anything about it. He (the Mayor) then said that if there was no truth in that report he would agree to withdraw certain of the Paoantui. However, no sooner had the Consul-General for Japan departed when reports began

1

3

4

6

5

7

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22 23

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

pouring into the Mayor's office substantiating the earlier reports of the arrival of Japanese reinforcements. Thus the Chinese side was compelled to adopt measures of self-defense." Q Do you remember those things being said by Mr. Yui? A If it appears in the record, he must have said so. L Did either you or Mr. OKAMOTO make the

slightest attempt to deny them?

A Denial of what?

To deny the statements about the arrival of the Japanese naval reinforcements?

A I didn't think it was necessary to deny that. Mr. Consul-General OKAMOTO spoke with Mayor Yui in English, but at necessary parts -- at necessary junctions I took part in the conversation and asked questions.

Why wasn't it necessary to deny it if it wasn't true?

I believe that Consul-General OKAMOTO did deny the statement -- such rumours.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: I believe the minutes as just read stated that he didn't know anything about it.

19 20

21

22

23

24

MR. COMYNS CARR: The minutes as just read stated that he said on the evening of the 11th in the interview with Mayor Yui that he didn't know anything about it; but when the statement was repeated on the afternoon of the 12th I can trace no attempt at a denial in the minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: I assume that this is a report at the meeting on the 12th and that the reply was made at that time.

MR. COMYNS CAR: In my submission that is not a proper interruption in cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: The minutes are clear, and they were tendered by the defense.

BY MR. COMYNS CARR:

Now did you hear this further discussion at the meeting?

MP. COMYNS CAPR: Language Division, I shall be reading the whole of page 11 except the first two lines and part of page 12:

(Reading) "Mr. OKAMOTO reminded the meeting that the danger of a clash was imminent, which caused Mr. Gauss to remark that apparently nothing could be done tonight.

"Mr. Yui observed that if the Chinese side was not encroached upon, nothing would happen tonight,

tomorrow night or any other night.

"Mr. Gauss enquired if Mr. Yui had anything to suggest which the Foreign Powers might attempt to do to alleviate the situation and which would be acceptable to the Chinese side.

"Mr. OKAMOTO interjected that some of the Japanese warships had left Shanghai this afternoon, whereupon Mr. Yui remarked that others may be coming.

"Mr. Davidson asked if it were possible to get an assurance from both sides not to make an attack within say 24 or 48 hours to see if something could be done in the meantime?

"Mr. Yui replied that he could give an assurance that if the Chinese side were not attacked, they would not attack, whether in 24 hours, 24 days or 24 years. The Chinese side were always on the defensive.

"Mr. OKAMOTO remarked that his side did not want to make any trouble so long as they were not provoked or challenged. That he could say with authority.

"Mr. Yui asked how Mr. OKAMOTO understood provocation. Mr. OKAMOTO replied that if the Japanese side were threatened they would attack.

1

2

6

7

8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

"Mr. Yui observed that the Chinese side "ould not attack but would defend themselves.

"Mr. OKAMOTO stated that a Japanese newspaper man had been arrested that morning at the North Station by Chinese troops stationed there. He was trying to find out where he was. That was provocation.

Mr. Yui related how the Commissioner of Public Utilities had been dragged out of his car last year and searched by Japanese Marines. Mr. OLAMOTO said it was useless to pursue those mutual recriminations.

"Mr. Davidson enquired if there were any independent Chinese Military units in the areas adjacent to the Japanese positions.

"Mr. Yui replied that he could give assurances that there were no independent units in those areas."

Q Did you agree with Mr. OKAMOTO when the Chinese said they would not attack unless they were attacked -- that the Japanese would attack if they were provoked or challenged?

It was always said that, unless we were attacked, we would not take the offensive.

Well, you see, that is the exact opposite of what Mr. OKAMOTO, according to the minutes, said. A I don't think it is the opposite.

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask at this point whether or not the part just read by the prosecutor was actually read to the witness because he may have been on a different circuit. May I be informed by the IBM Operator on that? Or perhaps the witness can inform us whether it was read to him.

THE MONITOR: The IBM Operator informs me that the witness did listen to the Japanese version.

	-
4	U
	u
-	d
	a
	ž
	W
	h
	a
	1
	е
	n

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(	Q W	e <b>11,</b> no	w, or	n page	9 of	your	afí	devi	t you	
say i	n the	third	and	fourt	h lin	es of	par	agrap	h 13	
that	the J	apanes	e on	the n	ornin	g of	the	13th	were	
fired	upon	from	the 1	ouildi	ng of	the	Comm	nercia	l Pres	SS
Wareh	ouse.	Wher	e is	that	in Sh	angha	1?			

- A At a distance of five or six hundred yards from the naval landing party.
- Q Is it the same place as the China Press Build-ing?
- A No, it isn't in the same place. It is in the middle of the Chapei District.
- Q Mr. OKAMOTO told us yesterday that the firing was from the China Press Building. Which of you is right?
  - A I think that must have been some mistake.
  - Q Were you there?
- A Yes, I was in the headquarters of the navel landing party.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that the same as the Commercial Bress Building?

A The same with what? I don't know what is meant by China Press Building.

THE PRESIDENT: In another part of the document the expression is "Commercial Press Building."

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is the witness! account.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

25

THE PRESIDENT: General Cramer and I discussed that yesterday afternoon.

Mh. COMYNS CARK: Perhaps we are not referring to the same document, your Honor. Does your Honor mean in Mr. OKAMOTO's affidavit he refers to two different buildings in two different parts?

THE PRESIDENT: During his evidence.

Q By that time, whoever actually fired the first shot, the position had got to the point when your forces were taking so strong a position there was bound to be an outbreak, hadn't it?

A We were following the principle of nonextension, and so if only one shot was fired the commanding officer was determined not to move his troops.

Q What I am suggesting to you is this: That nobody will ever know who fired the first shot, but the bringing up of huge reinforcements made an outbreak inevitable.

Mk. ROBERTS: I object to the question as being argumentative.

THE PRESIDENT: It could be looked at that way.

Q Do you say that from the naval headquarters you could, yourself, know where the shot came from?

A Yes. That came from the reports from officers

21

22

23

24

25

and soldiers, and also from lookouts.

Q Yes. But that means you can't say you, yourself, know anything about it, can you?

A Of course, I was in the operation room or else in the staff officers' room, so I wasn't upstairs on the lookout post so I could not have seen what happened.

Q I suggest to you that nobody from the naval larding party building could see either of the two buildings that have been referred to at all.

A To which buildings do you refer?

Q Either the one which you mentioned, the Commercial Press Building, or the one -- the Commercial Press Warehouse, or the one which Mr. OKAMOTO mentioned, the China Press Building.

A I don't know what the China Press refers to, but the Commercial Press--

THE MONITOR: I do not know whether China

Press is the English translation of the word which is

commonly translated as the Commercial Press Building -
Shomuin Shokan.

MR. COMYNS CARR: No. I thought we had agreed that they are too entirely different buildings in two different parts of the city.

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps the prosecutor has agreed

but I don't think the witness has agreed.

MA. COMYNS CARR: That is what the witness said.

Mk. hOBERTS: I believe the Court will recall that he said he wasn't familiar with the China Press Building and didn't know what the prosecutor was talking about.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Well, let's get it quite clear.

Q Do you agree that the Commercial Press Warehouse and the China Press Building are two entirely different buildings in different parts of Shanghai?

A I don't know what is referred to by the China Press Building.

Q Is not the China Press Building a newspaper office, and is not the Commercial Press Warehouse a publisher's warehouse?

A Yes, the Commercial Press Building is a book store.

Q Well, let's confine my question to that. I suggest to you that nobody from any part of the naval landing headquarters could see whether shots were coming from the Commercial Press Warehouse or not.

A It can clearly be seen. The Commercial Press Warehouse is a four or five story large building, and

9

8

2

3

10

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

anyone on top of that building can overlook the whole of Shanghei.

Q Are not the landing headquarters and the Commercial Press Warehouse in quite different roads?

A In entirely different -- on different roads, that is to say the Commercial Press Warehouse is in the Chapei District and the headquarters of the Japanese naval landing party is at the end of Extension Road.

MA. COMYNS CARA: Yes. I leave it there, your Honor.

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: Before you re-examine,

Mr. Roberts, I have the following questions to put to
the witness on behalf of a Member of the Court:

Did the reinforcements arrive in Shanghai without any previous notice to the Japanese navel landing party?

THE WITNESS: We received notification of the arrival of 1,000 reinforcements.

THE PRESIDENT: On what day and at what hour did you receive that notice?

THE WITNESS: I do not know the time, but it was after the OYAMA Incident.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. ROBERTS:

Q Mr. TAKEDA, on the reading of your testimony, a question was raised concerning your statement that the Peace Preservation Corps had been fixed at 2,000 and for the exclusion of cannon as means of arms. I want to read to you from the minutes of the Joint Meeting and ask you if that is the agreement that you referred to.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I object to this question. It does not arise out of cross-examination. During the reading I pointed out instead

of objecting to the witness' expressing opinions about the meaning of the Cease-Fire Agreement, I pointed out that the Cease-Fire Agreement did not contain any reference to either of those matters. As the construction of the agreement is a matter for the Court, I did not cross-examine about it at all.

If my friend after cross-examination wanted to refer to some other agreement, he could have done so by supplementary question after the reading of the affidavit. But it does not arise out of anything asked in cross-examination.

MR. ROBERTS: The prosecutor has specifically called the attention of the Court to the fact that the 2,000 mentioned in the affidavit was not understood as having come under this agreement. He likewise made the same reference to the statement of the witness that they were not supposed to have cannons and that the cannons they had was in contravention of the understanding.

We would like to show from the Chinese representative himself, exactly what the understanding was so that this Court may be clear.

THE PRESIDENT: The cross-examination has left nothing in doubt to be cleared up in this respect.

All we have to consider is the examination in chief,

Figure 1

page 2, and the agreement itself.

MR. ROBERTS: If your Honor please, there seems to be some misunderstanding. There seems to have been another agreement as to the number of troops which would be stationed there, Peace Preservation troops.

THE PRESIDENT: We can always give permission to open new matter under certain circumstances.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like your permission to ao that.

THE PRESIDENT: I think the Court is quite prepared to give you permission to refer to this new matter, to open this new matter.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, your Honor.

The minutes read as follows:

ing upon the signing of the 1932 Agreement the City Government of Greater Shanghai decided to establish the Peace Preservation Corps in Chapei beginning July 1st that year. As the Japanese side was not without apprehension lest this body, the Pae-An Tui as it is known in Chinese, should be something akin to a regular armed force, the Japanese delegate at the time, acting under instructions from his Government, asked Mr. O. K. Yui for information regarding the real

7

1

2

3

8

-

10

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

1 pas

2

3

7

8

9

page 2, and the agreement itself.

MR. ROBERTS: If your Honor please, there seems to be some misunderstanding. There seems to have been another agreement as to the number of troops which would be stationed there, Peace Preservation troops.

THE PRESIDENT: We can always give permission to open new matter under certain circumstances.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like your permission to

THE PRESIDENT: I think the Court is quite prepared to give you permission to refer to this new matter, to open this new matter.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, your Honor.

The minutes read as follows:

"Mr. OKALOTO rejoined by saying that following upon the signing of the 1932 Agreement the City
Government of Greater Shanghai decided to establish
the Peace Preservation Corps in Chapei beginning
July 1st that year. As the Japanese side was not
without apprehension lest this body, the Pae-An Tui
as it is known in Chinese, should be something akin to
a regular armed force, the Japanese delegate at the
time, acting under instructions from his Government,
asked Mr. O. K. Yui for information regarding the real

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

U

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

nature of the Pao-An Tui. Mr. Yui explained that the object in creating this body was no other than the maintenance of peace and order in Chapei; that the Pao-An Tui was so-called in order to distinguish it from the existing police force of the Public Safety Bureau and that the body was to be 2000 strong, which would be divided into two regiments, each regiment being subdivided into three battalions. Mr. Yui further declared that although revolvers, guns and machine guns would be supplied to the Pao-An Tui, tanks, armoured-cars and bomb-guns, etc., would not form parts of their equipment, and that soldiers of the regular army would on no account be incorporated into the said organization, whose members would be composed exclusively of a portion of the Peiping Pao-An Tui, constables of the Public Safety Bureau, and some ex-gendarmes. These statements of Mr. O, K. Yui at the time were recorded at his Consulate-General."

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, that does not purport to be, as suggested by my friend, anything said by Mr. Yui in the meeting. It purports to be something alleged by Mr. OKAMOTO in the meeting to have been said by Mr. Yui, not even to Mr. OKAMOTO himself but to some other Japanese official. And if you will follow down the micdle of page 8 of the minutes, you

will see Mr. Yui inquired of the chairman whether or not he should reply to Mr. OKAMOTO's remarks about the Peace Preservation Corps, but the chairman went on to a different subject, so the allegation was never replied to by Mr. Yui.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half-past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Spratt & Yelden

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ISANU TAKEDA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, there is one small correction I should like to make. I am told that I was mistaken in suggesting to the witness this morning that Mr. Powell was the editor of the North China Daily News. Mr. Powell's paper was the China Weekly. It does not affect the point of my question because the witness told me that the representative of the North China Daily News was one of those taking part in the inquiry of which he spoke.

THE PRESIDENT: Until the defense ask us to accept Mr. Powell as a reliable reporter of events.

Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: As far as I recall the prosecutor mentioned that Mr. Powell had testified something to the contrary from that stated by the witness; wasn't

that so?

2

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

MR. COMYNS CARR: No.

MR. ROBERTS: I take it that the Court will disregard the reference made to Mr. Powell previously then as the editor of the China Daily News. Might we further assume that if the Court does not accept the statements and the book of Mr. Powell that it will not accept statements from the prosecution as well. I refer to statements from the book, of course.

THE PRESIDENT: The best way to treat your observations is with contemptuous silence. You are warning us against accepting his evidence, something which we know is not evidence.

MR. ROBERTS: I was simply trying to clarify the situation, if your Honor please, so that it will be clear in my own mind.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERTS (Continued):

Q Referring to the statement in your affidavit on page 2, Mr. TAKEDA, concerning the force of the Peace Preservation Corps having been determined at 2000 and the equipment that they were to have, can you tell us when and how this agreement was arrived at?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, obviously he

4 5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

19 20

18

21 22

23 24

25

cannot. With my friend having already read the allegation of Mr. OKAMOTO that it was an agreement supposed to have been arrived at between Mr. Yui and another unnamed Foreign Office official how can this gentleman possibly know about it?

MR. ROBERTS: That is exactly the point. We want to find out with whom the agreement was made and who participated.

THE PRESIDENT: Does he know?

MR. ROBERTS: I believe he does, if your Honor please.

THE PRESIDENT: Ask him.

Q Do you know, Mr. TAKEDA, of the agreement that you refer to on page 2 of the affidavit concerning the number of troops in the Peace Preservation Corps and the type of armaments they were supposed to carry?

A Yes.

Q Can you tell us if this arose out of the agreement of May 5, 1932?

A Yes.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, ought not the witness first to be asked whether he was present when the alleged agreement was made and if it was alleged to be in writing where the documents are?

MR. ROBERTS: I believe this will all be

.

the president: You should know because he is your witness and you know what he can say.

MR. ROBERTS: That is correct.

Q Now, will you tell us how this agreement came to be drawn and under what circumstances?

A In accordance with the provisions of the main text of the truce agreement there is a provision that after the conclusion of the agreement the Japanese forces were to withdraw into the International Settlement and that their place — that the place or the functions performed by the Japanese forces were to be taken over by the Chinese police. Being desirous of knowing some concrete details of what was to take place after the withdrawal of the Japanese forces the Japanese side, in accordance with the instructions from the Japanese Government, inquired of the Chinese municipal government what type of arrangement they were going to create thereafter —

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I object. The witness was not here, was not in Shanghai according to his affidavit, until December 1936 and he is now purporting to tell us something that happened in 1932.

THE INTERPRETER: "I was there in 1932," said the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: He can contradict himself. We cannot stop him. His last word may be as good if not better than his first.

Q Will you proceed to tell us about the agreement, Mr. TAKEDA?

A The reply of the municipal government to the Japanese inquiry came in an official document. The contents were as follows:--

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Carr, you have to observe that red light. General paralysis will set in if you don't do that. After all, we are not a jury and we can afford to hear these things which prove to be inadmissible.

FR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor --

THE PRESIDENT: I know it is very provoking but still we all have to suffer.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I reminded
my friend that he should first ask whether the document was in writing and if so where it is. Now after
all these questions it appears that there is alleged
to be a document and the document is not produced.
Your Honor will remember at the beginning of this
particular section I pointed out that owing to the
failure to cross-examine our witness about this Shanghai
matter we had no proper notice of what was intended to

2

1

4

,

7

8

9

,

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

be alleged. Under those circumstances in my submission it is proper for us to endeavor to be strict as to the type of material put before the Tribunal as evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: These matters are of vital importance and adequate proof should be offered. The only way to prove a document adequately is to produce it or account for its absence.

MR. ROBERTS: I believe the witness will show that it is not our document; that it was drawn by another authority, the municipal council, and that we have no means of obtaining that or of having it in our control. The witness will bring that out.

THE PRESIDENT: My colleagues are in grave doubt whether you understand the rule which I have laid down repeatedly that if you want to prove the contents of a document you must produce it or account for its absence in such a way that you must be excused from producing it. There is no requirement that I have stated more frequently and my colleagues are at a loss to know why counsel does not understand what I am saying about it.

MR. ROBERTS: We are not particularly interested in proving the contents of that document or any particular document except to have this witness

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 explain the figure of 2000 and the limitation of arms which he claims comes under the original armistice terms.

THE PRESIDENT: If the proof rests on the contents of an agreement the agreement must be produced or its absence accounted for. You cannot talk us out of that.

Q Mr. TAKEDA, do you know who drew the original agreement that you refer to?

A This was received from the Chinese side and the Naval Landing Party had a copy of it.

Q Do you know who drew the original?

A This was drawn up by the municipal government of the Chinese side and was sent by the mayor, the Chinese mayor, as an official document.

Q Do you know whether the original document is in existence today or net?

A I should think that they would be at the Japanese Consulate General.

Q Are you speaking about the original document, Mr. TAKEDA?

THE PRESIDENT: He is; he said so. He said the original was sent somewhere.

MR. ROBERTS: I didn't think it was clear.
I thought he said a copy was sent there.

THE PRESIDENT: You must hear the evidence as we hear it and if you appreciate it you would not misunderstand it.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Roberts, may I say a word?
The original text was sent to the Consulate General
and a copy thereof came to the Japanese Naval Landing
Party headquarters.

THE PRESIDENT: The original is with the Consulate General as far as we know; now get it.

IR. ROBERTS: We shall make a search and if it is there I assure you we shall produce it.

Q Mr. TAKEDA, will you please tell us the distance from the Commercial Press Warehouse to the naval headquarters?

A About 500 to 600 yards.

MR. ROBERTS: May I state with reference to the agreement referred to that in view of the fact that Shanghai is now in the hands of the Chinese, perhaps we might call upon the prosecution to aid us in attempting to procure that document if it is possible.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to discuss ways and means here. You know that the correct thing is to apply in Chambers to me. The Charter fully deals with this situation.

Q Mr. TAKEDA, will you describe to us what you

2

5

7

0

10

11

12

14

15

16 17

: 18

19

20

22

23 24

call the prohibited zone in Shanghai.

THE PRESIDENT: This is really new matter which is not covered by our permission but--

MR. ROBERTS: It is leading into the question of the Extension Road where the incident of Lieutenant OYAMA occurred.

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead.

A Whether it be the forces, the armed forces, or the civilians of any country the Settlement Roads and the Extra-Settlement Roads or Extension Roads were used as -- they acted on the Extension Roads as they did within the Settlement.

Q In other words the Extension Roads were regarded in the same manner as the Settlement itself?

A Exactly, yes.

Q Do you recall about the time that evacuees and refugees were brought from Shanghai to Hankow and other parts of China?

A Yes.

Q Will you tell us when that occurred?

A Japanese residents of Hankow evacuated the city and were brought to Shanghai on gunboats, destroyers and steamships arriving at Shanghai on the 10th of August the day after the killing of Lieutenant OYAMA.

Q Did this occasion considerable activity in

.

9

1

2

3

5

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

Shanghai at that time?

of the body as a trick?

2

A The fact that they came to Shanghai did not create -- did not become any particular stimulus.

4

Q Now, you refer to a trick as you characterized it on the part of the Chinese with reference to the shooting of the Chinese soldier. Were you referring to the shooting of the soldier or the placing

7

6

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, he made it

9

quite clear that he meant both.

11

THE PRESIDENT: What do you wish to clarify, Mr. Roberts?

12

MR. ROBERTS: That there is some misunderstanding that the Chinese soldier may have been regarded as having been shot deliberately by the Chinese and

15 16

14

having his body placed there as a trick.

MR. COMYNS CARR: And that is precisely what

17 18

the witness said and any question designed to get him to alter his testimony is in my submission improper.

19 20

21

22

THE PRESIDENT: My colleagues agree with your version and one has made a note; so your question is not directed to explain anything that has been left obscure and is not re-examination in the proper sense.

23

The objection is allowed.

25

24

Q Mr. TAKEDA, are you familiar with the detachment

of marines that was placed near the 8th Character Bridge?

A Yes.

- Q How many men were in that detachment?
- A A few with an NCO as its chief.
- Q Were there any Japanese properties or residents in that area?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Tell us what type of property, please?

A The place just mentioned by you was about 300 meters distant from the Naval Landing Party head-quarters. At that point the Naval Landing Party had some land, some lots. In this vicinity there were Japanese temples, Japanese cemetery, glass manufacturing company and saki breveries, and around these establishments there were a large number of Japanese residents there. The famous Rokusankaen Japanese restaurant was also located in this district.

Q Did this detachment operate in concert with the special municipal police and the Chinese police?

A Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: That completes the redirect examination. May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

2

3

4

5

....

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

Greeberg & Horse

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROBERTS: We shall now present proof of the facts surrounding certain incidents which occurred in and around Shanghai and Nanking in August and December, 1937 for the purpose of showing this Tribunal that the incidents were not a deliberate or systematic plan to conquer China or to drive out all American and British from China as claimed by the prosecution. On the contrary, we shall prove to this Tribunal that Japan took extreme reasures to prevent any undue hardships to foreign nations and their properties; and, where accidental damage or injury occurred due to existing conditions, they pursued a course of settlement and adjustment to the complete satisfaction of those affected. It will further be shown that Japan reted out swift punishment to those responsible for carelessness or disregard of the regulations.

It is the contention of the defense that some incidents such as the Panay case and the Lady-bird case, having been amicably adjusted, should be regarded as closed incidents.

I now present Mr. SOMIYA who will offer some of the proof aforementioned.

THE PRESIDENT: Counsellor SOMIYA.

3 4

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

16

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

MR. SOMIYA: The documents will give proof of the so-called Hugessen case.

First I offer in evidence defense document No. 71, which is the reply of the Foreign Minister addressed to the British \*rbassador to Japan, dated September 6, 1937, relative to the Ambassador Hugessen injury case.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No.

71 will be given exhibit No. 2519.

(whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2519 and received in evidence.)

MR. SOMIYA: I shall read exhibit No. 2519:

"REPLY OF THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS

TO THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR, SEPTEMBER 9.

"Monsieur l'Ambassadeur:

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the note, No. 125, under the date of August 29, addressed to me by Mr. J. L. Dodds, then Charge d'Affaires of the British Embassy, concerning the incident in which Sir Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen was wounded.

"The Japanese Government, on receiving the news of the event in question, took a grave view

sions of profound sympathy to His Britannic Majesty's Government and to Sir Hughe through myself and the Ambassadors to the Court of St. James and to Chira respectively and, at the same time, they sent urgent instructions to the authorities on the spot to investigate the case thoroughly. Although the results of these investigations have so far failed to produce any evidence to establish that the shooting was done by a Japanese aeroplane, the Japanese Government is taking measures for further investigations by the authorities on the spot in order to spare no efforts to ascertain the facts of the case.

possible to determine whether or not the responsibility for the incident rests with Japan. Nevertheless, in view of the traditional ties of friendship which bind Japan and Great Britain, the Japanest Government express their profound regret that Sir Hughe should have met with such a misfortune incidental to the hostilities that were actually in progress in the region of Taitsang on that particular day.

"In this connection, I wish to assure

Your Excellency that the Japanese forces always take the fullest precautions against causing injuries to non-combatants, and it is certainly very far from the desire of the Japanese Government that such an unfortunate event should ever occur in future through any fault of their own. Fresh instructions have consequently been sent to their authorities on the spot to excercise the strictest caution in this regard. I earnestly hope, therefore, that the British authorities will, on their part, kindly cooperate with the Japanese authorities with a view to forestalling the recurrence of a similar event by taking such necessary measures as giving notice in advance to the Japanese authorities on the spot when entering a zone of danger.

"In making the above ad interim reply, I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

"Sir Robert Craigie

"His Britannic Majesty's Ambassador to Japan."

Secondly, I would like to call the attention of the Court to exhibit No. 265 which was al-2 ready introduced by the prosecution section. This 3 is a document entitled "Our Final Reply on the Injury Case of the British Ambassador to China," addrassed to the British Ambassador to Japan from the Foreign Minister, dated September 21, 1937. This document will prove that, should the said 9 accident be attributable to the Jananese Army, it 10 is due to their having mistaken the Ambassador 11 Hugessen's automobile for either a military bus 12 or auto-truck and not an intentional act.

I next offer defense document No. 73, which is the letter under the date of September 23, 1937, addressed to the Foreign Minister by the British Arbassador to Japan. It proves that this case was settled between both countries concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No.

73 will be given exhibit No. 2520.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2520 and received in evidence.)

MR. SOMIYA: I shall read exhibit No.

2520.

.

21

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23 24

"NOTE OF THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR TO THE \*2

MINISTER FOR FORFIGN AFFAIRS. "British Embassy

"Tokyo "23rd September, 1937.

"No. 148.

"Monsieur le Ministre,

"I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that I duly communicated to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom the terms of the Note which Your Excellency addressed to me on the 21st September in regard to the attack on His Majesty's Ambassedor in China by two aeroplanes in the neighborhood of Shanghai on 26th August last.

"2. I have now received instructions from His Majesty's Government to state that they have received this communication with satisfaction and regard the incident as glosed.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration."

Signed: "R. L. Craigie."

To: "His Excellency

"Mr. Koki HIROTA

"H.I.J.M. Minister for Foreign Affairs."

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

I next offer defense document No. 1076, being the excerpt from the article in the ASAHI dated November 24, 1937.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, defense document No. 1076 is a press release appearing in a Japanese newspaper. It purmorts to set out selected excerpts from what was said during question time in the British House of Commons. This document, we submit, is subject to the same objections as has been made in respect of other press releases and possesses no probative velue.

MR. SOMIYA: The portions I am intending to read are those pertaining to this incident --

THE MONITOR: Excerpts from this document.

MR. SOMIYA: (Continuing) This report was based upon telegrams sent by the Domei News Agency from London relating to a debate in the British House of Commons. I feel that the reading of this document should be permitted inasmuch as the contents of this document are of a public character.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document. MR. SOMIYA: We shall offer proof next

24

25

2

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

regarding the so-called Panay Incident by documents and witnesses.

Now we shall offer defense document No.

136. This document was what was addressed by the
Foreign Minister to the American Ambassador to
Japan on December 14, 1937. It was evidence that
this incident was entirely due to mis-bombing.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigedier Nolan.

bunal, this document is also a press release and, as such, would be objectionable. It does, however, contain the note of the Japanese Government to the Gevernment of the United States, dated 14 December, 1937, and really nothing but the note. The prosecution is satisfied that this document is a true copy of the original note in question; and, in order to obviate any unnecessary delay, we feel that this might be a convenient manner in bringing it to the attention of the Tribunal.

somewhat inconsistent, aren't you? As much could have been said for the document just rejected. If that press release, purporting to contain a question and an enswer in the House of Commons, is at all relevant, and you did not take the ground that

it was irrelevant, you probably do not question the reliability of the newspaper account.

You see, we have to be satisfied of that probative value. You are telling us that the document now tendered has probative value because you are satisfied it is a correct statement of the Japanese Foreign Minister's despatch. But you withhold your imprimatur from the document just rejected. You are entitled to do so, but it seems to me to be a matter for comment.

bunel, this document, on its face, is open to precisely the same objection as the document we have just dealt with. What I am endeavoring to do is to explain to the Tribunal that this document, containing as it does a true copy of the note itself, might afford a convenient method in bringing the contents of that note before the Tribunal. I am well aware of the fact that the proper way to prove the note is to produce it. Thus, it would have been proper to prove what took place in the House of Commons by effering a copy of the transcript to the Tribunal. I was merely trying to save time. And if it should appear that I'm being inconsistent, I object to the document.

it was irrelevant, you probably do not question the reliability of the newspaper account.

You see, we have to be satisfied of that probative value. You are telling us that the document now tendered has probative value because you are satisfied it is a correct statement of the Japanese Foreign Minister's despatch. But you withhold your imprimatur from the document just rejected. You are entitled to do so, but it seems to me to be a matter for comment.

bunel, this document, on its face, is open to precisely the same objection as the document we have just dealt with. What I am endeavoring to do is to explain to the Tribunal that this document, containing as it does a true copy of the note itself, might afford a convenient method in bringing the contents of that note before the Tribunal. I am well aware of the fact that the proper way to prove the note is to produce it. Thus, it would have been proper to prove what took place in the House of Commons by effering a copy of the transcript to the Tribunal. I was merely trying to save time. And if it should appear that I'm being inconsistent, I object to the document.

MR. SOMIYA: The document I am about to tender to the Court is not an excerpt or an extract from a newspaper. It is an official document sent by the Foreign Minister of Japan to the United States Ambassador, and the certificate makes clear that the text of this document is true and correct, and I believe that this document should be admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court admits the document on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 136 will be given exhibit No. 2521.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2521 and received in evidence.)

MR "N

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

MR. SOMIYA: I shall now read exhibit 2521: "Note of the Japanese Government to the U.S.

Government dated December 14, 1937.

"Text of the Note.

"December 14, 1937.

"Monsieur l'Ambassadeur:

"Regarding the incident of the 12th December in which the United States gunboat Panay and three steamers belonging to the Standard Oil Company were sunk by the bombing of the Japanese naval aircraft on the Yangtze River at a point about twenty-six miles above Nanking, I had the honour, as soon as unofficial information of the incident was brought to my knowledge, to request Your Excellency to transmit to the Government of the United States the apologies of the Japanese Government. From the reports subsequently received from our representatives in China, it has been established that the Japanese naval air force, acting upon information that the Chinese troops fleeing from Nanking were going up the river in steamers, took off to pursue them, and discovered such vessels at the above mentioned point. Owing to poor visibility, however, the aircraft, although they descended to fairly low altitudes, were unable to discern any mark to show that any one of them was an American ship or man-of-war.

21 22

19

20

23

Consequently the United States gunboat Panay and the vessels of the Standard Oil Company, being taken for Chinese vessels carrying fleeing Chinese troops, were bombed and sunk.

"While it is clear, in the light of the above circumstances, that the present incident was entirely due to a mistake, the Japanese Government regret most profoundly that it has caused damages to the United States man-of-war and ships and casualties among those on board, and desire to present hereby sincere apologies. The Japanese Government will make indemnification for all the losses and deal appropriately with those responsible for the incident. Furthermore, they have already issued strict orders to the authorities on the spot with a view to preventing the recurrence of a similar incident.

"The Japanese Government in the fervent hope that the friendly relations between Japan and the United States will not be affected by this unfortunate affair, have frankly stated as above their sincere attitude, which I beg Your Excellency to make known to your Government.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the expression of my highest consideration.

"Signed: Koki HIROTA.

"His Excellency, Mr. Joseph C. Grew, Ambassador of the United States to Japan."

Now we shall offer defense document No. 330.

This is a statement made by the military section of

General Headquarters on December 22, 1947. It will

evidence the fact that the Japanese armed troops

stationed near the scene immediately relieved the

injured and tried to stop the bombing and the fact that

no machinegun was fired.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, we object to this document No. 330. It is a press release emanating not from the Var Ministry, as one might suppose, but from the Foreign Office. On several occasions the Tribunal has indicated that if a report were from a formation in the field it might be adduced in evidence. An examination of this report will make it clear that it is not a report from a formation in the field but it is something that has been dressed up, as the last paragraph will make abundantly clear.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr.SOMIYA.

MR. SOMIYA: This is a release or announcement made by the Army Department of the Imperial General Headquarters, and there is a certificate from the Foreign

.

Office attached. In my understanding this is an announcement of the Imperial General Headquarters in the files of the Foreign Office, and I believe that this certificate is correct and accurate. As regards the document, the contents of the document, this is -- they are a result of an investigation. Even in the case of the prosecution during its presentation of evidence, it has offered in evidence which was not carried out on the spot and has been admitted.

THE INTERPRETER: Even during the prosecution's presentation of evidence, reports of investigations not carried out in the field or on the spot have been accepted by this Court.

MR. SOMIYA: The Court has also admitted a report of the United States inquiry commission on the Panay Incident, and in view of that fact I believe that this document should also be accepted into evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. SOMIYA: Next I shall offer in evidence defense document No. 82, the statement of the Foreign Office issued on December 24, 1937, concerning this incident by which I shall establish that in view of this incident the Japanese Government took such prudential measures as to further send an instruction

to units on the spot to especially respect the rights and interests of third nations.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 82

will be given exhibit No. 2522.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2522 and received in evidence.)

MR. SOMIYA: I shall read a part of exhibit No. 2522. The middle of page 2:

requests mentioned in Your Excellency's Note, namely, a recorded expression of regret, and indemnifications, no word needs to be added to what I have said in my aforementioned Note. Is regards the guarantee for the future, I wish to inform Your Excellency that the Japanese Navy issued without delay strict orders to 'exercise the greatest caution in every area where warships and other vessels of America or any other third Power are present, in order to avoid a recurrence of a similar mistake'. Furthermore, rigid orders have been issued to the military, naval, and foreign office authorities to pay, in the light of the present untoward incident, greater attention than hitherto to observance of the instructions that have been repeatedly

given against infringement of the rights and interests of the United States and other third Powers. And the Japanese Government are studying carefully every possible means of achieving more effectively the above-stated aims, while they have already taken steps to ascertain, in still closer contact with American authorities in China, the whereabouts of American interests and nationals, and to improve the means of communicating intelligence thereof speedily and effectively to the authorities on the spot.

other vessels of the United States was due to a mistake as has been stated above, those who were concerned with the attack have been duly dealt with, on the ground of a failure to take the fullest measures of precaution. The Japanese Government are thus endeavouring to preclude absolutely all possibility of the recurrence of incidents of a similar character. It is my fervent hope that the fact will be fully appreciated by the Government of the United States that this drastic step has been taken solely because of the sincere desire of the Japanese Government to safeguard the rights and interests of the United States and other third Powers.

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew

to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration."

I should add the title: "From Foreign Office announcement concerning the Panay Incident. Foreign Minister HIROTA requested U.S. /mbassadore to Japan Grew to call on him on 24 December 1937 and handed him a reply concerning the Panay Incident."

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. SOMIYA.

MR. SOMIYA: Next I shall offer in evidence defense document No. 81, a communication from the American Ambassador under date of December 26, 1937, by which I shall give proof of the American Government's satisfaction with the measures taken by the Japanese Government.

THE PERSIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLFRK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 81 will receive exhibit No. 2523.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2523 and received in evidence.)

MR. SOMIYA: I shall read Court exhibit 2523.

(Reading): "NOTE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT, DATED DECEMBER 26, 1937, REGARDING THE PANAY INCIDENT.

"Embassy of the United States of America "Tokyo, December 26, 1937.

"Excellency:

"I have the honor, by the direction of my

Government, to address to Your Excellency the following note:

"The Government of the United States refers to its note of December 14, the Japanese Government's note of December 14 and the Japanese Government's note of December 24 in regard to the attack by Japanese armed forces upon the U.S.S. PANAY and three American merchant ships.

it was stated that "The Government of the United States requests and expects of the Japanese Government a formally recorded expression of regret, an understanding to make complete and comprehensive indemnifications, and an assurance that definite and specific steps have been taken which will ensure that hereafter American nationals, interests and property in China will not be subjected to attack by Japanese armed forces or unlawful interference by any Japanese authorities or forces whatsoever."

"In regard to the first two items of the request made by the Government of the United States, the Japanese Government's note of December 24 reaffirms statements made in the Japanese Government's note of December 14 which read "The Japanese Government regret most profoundly that it (the present incident)

has caused damages to the United States' man-of-war and ships and casualties among those on board, and desire to present hereby sincere apologies. The Japanese Government will make indemnifications for all the losses and will deal appropriately with those responsible for the incident." to the third item of the request made by the United States, the Japanese Government's note of December 24 recites certain definite and specific steps which the Japanese Government has taken to ensure, in words of that note, "against infringement of, or unwarranted interference with, the rights and interests of the United States and other third Powers" and states that "The Japanese Government are thus endeavoring to preclude absolutely all possibility of the recurrence of incidents of a similar character."

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"The Government of the United States observed with satisfaction the promptness with which the Japanese Government in its note of December 14 admitted responsibility, expressed regret, and offered amends.

"'The Government of the United States regards
the Japanese Government's account, as set forth in
the Japanese Government's note of December 24, of

action taken by it as responsive to the request made by the Government of the United States in this Government's note of December 14.

"'With regard to the facts of the origins, causes and circumstances of the incident, the Japanese Government indicates in its rote of December 24 the conclusion at which the Japanese Government, as a result of its investigation, has arrived. With regard to these same matters, the Government of the United States relies on the report of firdings of the court of inquiry of the United States Navy, a copy of which has been communicated officially to the Japanese Government.

"'It is the earnest hope of the Government of the United States that the steps which the Japanese Government has taken will prove effective toward preventing any further attacks or unlawful interference by Japanese authorities or forces with American nationals, interests or property in China."

"I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

"Signed: Joseph C. Grew.

"His Excellency, Mr. Koki HIRCTA, His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs."

1 2

I next offer in evidence defense document No. 1196, the statement of the Foreign Office issued on March 23, 1938, by which I wish to establish the amount of indemnity claimed by the American Government.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADILE NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, this document No. 1196 is a press release from the Foreign Office. It is open to the objection that it purports to prove the contents of the diplomatic note and we submit the proper proof of the note should be production of the document itself.

THE PRESIDENT: In a matter of this importance undoubtedly that is so.

Mi. SOMIYA: The Foreign Office certificate does not certify to any press release or newspaper story. The contents of this document carries the note of the United States Ambassador. The entire contents of this document is of an official character.

THE PRESIDENT: The certificate is not as to the dispatch itself, but as to the statement of the Foreign Office which includes the note or purports to do so.

I have been asked by at least two Members of the Tribunal to inquire whether the prosecution

contest the accuracy of the dispatch mentioned in the statement of the Foreign Office.

BYIGADIER NOLAN: May it please your Honor, the dispatch as contained in document 1196 has proven after investigation to be a true and accurate copy of the original document.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal overrules the objection and admits the document.

No. 1196 will receive exhibit No. 2524.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2524 and received in evidence.)

.

3

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

18

20

17

21

23 24

25

ial?

MR. SOMIYA: I shall read exhibit 2524.

MR. ROBERTS: There is obviously an error in reading the English copy. The date was read as l'arch 23. 1933; it should be 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: It is 1938 in the Judges' copies.

MR. SOMIYA: I next offer in evidence defense document No. 401-21, to show that reparations have already been made.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGARIER NOLAN: If it please the Tribunal, the presecution objects to document 401-21 on the ground that it does not add anything to what we already know. It is, we submit, merely recapitulation of the diplomatic steps which were taken in this matter, proof of which is already in evidence.

MR. SOMIYA: I intend to read only the last two lines of this document, that is, with respect to the indemnification in accordance with the American request --

THE MONITOR: Completion of indemnification.
THE PRESIDENT: How is it relevant or mater-

MR. SOMIYA: I think it is relevant to show that the indemnification with regard to the PANAY

had been paid by the Japanese Covernment.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that in your evidence, in the prosecution's, that the indemnity was paid?

MR. TAVENNER: No, sir, the fact that indemnity was paid does not appear in the prosecution's evidence.

MR. SOMIYA: Furthermore, this document is an official document of the United States Department of State.

THE PRESIDENT: It is the last two lines of the first page that state the indemnity was paid.

MR. SOMIYA: In the Japanese text it is the last fourth and fifth lines of the last page; in the English copy the last two lines of the first page.

THE PRESIDENT: That is right.

The objection is overruled and the document admitted to that extent, that is to say, the extent of the last two lines on the first page.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 401-21 will receive exhibit No. 2525.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2525 and received in evidence.)

MR. SOMIYA: I shall read exhibit 2525, the last two lines.

1.3

"The Japanese Government later made full indemnification in accordance with the request of the United States."

MR. SOMIYA: I next offer in evidence defense document No. 206-D-19, being excerpts from the diary of former United States ambassador Grew. I intend only to read a portion of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

the prosecution object to the introduction of this document. It is inother excerpt from the diary of former United States Ambassador Grew. The first paragraph is clearly irrelevant, as it only purports to give us the opinion of Mr. Grew on the American political situation. The remainder of the document deals with what took place at a conference and what the Ambassador said and what he subsequently did in respect of the exchange of notes.

It is also submitted by the prosecution that, having regard to the importance of evidence of this kind, another method of proof should be utilized by the defense.

M. SOMIYA: I intend only to read the second paragraph of this document. This is a note with respect to an official conference which took place

in the official residence of Ambassador Grew. contents therein recorded are facts and therefore I believe that it should be admitted as evidence. THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document. MR. SOMIYA: Defense counsel Roberts will next ask to call a witness, AOKI, Takeshi. 7 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts. MR. ROBERTS: We call the witness AOKI, 9 Takeshi. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Did you say you were recall-11 12 ing him? MR. ROBERTS: "e are calling him. 13 14 TAKESHI AOKI, called as a witness on 15 behalf of the defense, being first sworn, 16 testified through Japanese interpreters as 17 18 follows: 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. ROBERTS:

o Please state your name and address.

Name, AOKI, Takeshi; my address, No. 761 Horiuchi, Hayama, Kanagawa-Ken Prefecture.

MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be shown defense document No. 1291?

25

21

22

23

(Whereupon, a document was handed to 1 the witness.) 2 Please examine this document and tell us 3 whether or not it is your sworn affidevit. 4 A (Examining) This is my affidavit. 5 MR. ROBERTS: I offer it in evidence. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual 7 8 terms. 9 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1291 10 will receive exhibit No. 2526. (Whereupon, the document above referred 12 to was marked defense exhibit 2526 and received 13 in evidence.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Whalen & Duda

MR. ROBERTS: I read exhibit No. 2526. "I was the Liaison Officer between the

"I was the Liaison Officer between the Second Combined Air Corps and the Expeditionary Forces in China. I arrived in Shanghai in mid-September 1937. I was a staff officer of the Third Fleet and concurrently a staff officer of the Shanghai Expeditionary Forces.

"My duties were to supply information to
the Naval forces and to send requests from the Army
to the Navy. I was also a Naval expert within the
Army and in order to maintain liaison I made
periodic flights to and from the airfield and the Headquarters of the Third Fleet.

"On Lecember 12, 1937 requests were received from the Army to bomb Chinese ships in which Chinese soldiers were fleeing from Nanking. It was reported that seven or eight large Chinese merchants ships filled with Chinese troops were fleeing up the Yangtze River and they requested assistance from the Naval Air Squadron in preventing this movement. I transmitted this request to the Air Corps by telephone. The Air Corps consented and sent several planes on the requested mission.

"At that time, according to the Army reports, there were no foreign ships in the vicinity of

Nanking. It was later reported that the mission was carried out with excellent results.

"On December 14, 1937, I heard for the first time the bombing of the SS 'Panay.' The first report stated that a foreign ship might have been bombed and I became aware of the facts when I reached Shanghai to investigate the facts in connection with this report. At Shanghai I discovered that the 'Panay' had been bombed in error, having been mistaken for one of the Chinese vessels attempting to flee from Nanking. The subsequent report of the pilot stated that the bombing of the 'Panay' was clearly an error on his part and that he had no intention of bombing a foreign vessel. It was his belief that the 'Panay' was one of the Chinese vessels fleeing from Nanking.

"In so far as the reported machine gunning of the crew is concerned, the report of the pilot denied that such machine gunning had taken place. It was not the practice of the pilots in such bombing missions to machine gun their targets.

"Very strict orders had been issued by the Commander of the Third Fleet and the Commander of the Air Corps that care should be taken not to bomb foreign ships and this incident was regarded with extreme regret. For that reason, those who were

regarded as being guilty of carelessness or possible negligence were punished."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Sutton.

MR. SUTTON: If it please the Tribunal, the prosecution does not desire to cross-examine for the reason that its evidence with regard to the Panay Incident appears in the report of the U. S. Navy Boarc of Inquiry, exhibit 263, pages 3517 to 3530 of the transcript of proceedings, and in excerpts from the interrogation of HASHIMOTO which appear as exhibit 258 at page 3466 and exhibit 2188 at page 15678 of the transcript of proceedings.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MR. ROBERTS: I now present Mr. Harris, who will present further proof -- I ask that the witness be excused on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Harris.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. President, we shall now offer proof through three brief documents concerning the incident which occurred on 12 December 1937 when the British vessel, Ladybird, was shelled at Wuhu because of mistaken identity.

7 8

 We now offer in evidence defense document
No. 1039, which is the official note of the Japanese
Government which the Foreign Minister, HIROTA, Koki,
sent to Sir Robert Craigie on Lecember 14, 1937,
regarding the incident of the shelling of the Ladybird.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1039

will receive exhibit No. 2527.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2527 and received in evidence.)

MR. HARRIS: I shall now read exhibit No. 2527.

"The Official Note of the Japanese Government which the Foreign Minister, HIROTA, Koki, Sent to Sir Robert Craigie (December 14, 1937).

"Monsieur l'Ambassadeur:

"I have the honour to state that the
Japanese Government regret profoundly the incidents
of the 12th instant, in which British men-of-war, the
Lacybira, the Bee, the Cricket and the Scarab, were
subjected by mistake to gunfire and aerial bombing
by Japanese forces in the vicinities of Wuhu and Nanking, and to express herewith to Your Excellency on
behalf of my Government their sincere apologies. I
desire to inform Your Excellency that the Japanese

4

6

7

8

9

..

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

22

23

25

to prevent the recurrence of an incident of such character, and to add that they will, upon the completion of investigations, deal appropriately with those responsible for the incidents, and also that they are prepared to make the necessary indemnification for the losses sustained by the British.

Government have immediately taken the necessary steps

"It is, let me say in conclusion, the fervent hope of the Japanese Government that the traditional friendship between Japan and Great Britain will not be affected by these unfortunate incidents.

"I avail myself of this opportunity of renewing to Your Excellency the assurances of my high considerations.

"(signed) Koki, HIROTA.

"His Excellency, The Right Honourable Sir Robert Craigie."

We now offer in evidence defense document
No. 170, which is an official statement made on
30 December 1937 by the Japanese Foreign Office
regarding the incident of the shelling of the Ladybird.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the

Tribunal, we object to document 170 as being a press

release emanating from the Foreign Office.

While I have 'made no investigation as to the Japanese note contained in the document, I would like to draw the attention of the Tribunal to the statement contained in the document that it is only the essential contents of the note that are being reproduced.

MR. HARRIS: It is true that this is a statement of the Foreign Office regarding the incident, but it is maintained that the contents of the Japanese note are contained in the passage which appears below the first paragraph.

The certificate indicates that this is an exact and true copy of the official translation of the Japanese Foreign Office.

MR. HARRIS: I might add, Mr. President, that an attempt was made to get the original note but the reply to our request was received too late for us to process it and have it available. I would further like to state, Mr. President, that we have the statement of the Foreign Office to the effect that the original note is not available after a search of the records.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, London will have the

original, of course.

MR. HARRIS: It is our intention to take the necessary steps to try to secure that, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Whether these are the essential contents we den't know. That apparently is the opinion of the person who drafted this.

MR. HARRIS: Of course, I assumed, when we requested the Foreign Office official document setting forth the contents of the note of the 28th of December and we received this, that this was the official note.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court uphelds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. HARKIS: We now offer in evidence defense document No. 1013 which is a certified statement from the British Foreign Office acknowledging the payment by the Japanese Government of the British Government's claim for damages to the "Ladybird."

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1013

will receive exhibit No. 2528.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2528 and received in evidence.)

MR. HARRIS: I shall now read exhibit No. 2528.
"United Kingdom Liaison Mission in Japan,
British Embassy, Tokyo.

"Certificate

"His Majesty's Ship LADYBIRD was damaged by Japanese artillery fire at Wuhu on December 12th, 1937. Damage was originally assessed at 3,830 pounds but this figure was later reduced to 2,942 pounds. A claim for 2,942 pounds was presented to the Japanese Government on August 18th, 1938, and a cheque for this amount was paid to His Majesty's Ambassador, Tokyo, on August 31st, 1938.

"(Signed) A. D. F. Gascoigne. His Brittanic

Majesty's Political Representative and Head of the United Kingdom Liaison Mission in Japan.

"20th March, 1947."

This concludes for the present the list of

This concludes for the present the list of documents to be introduced by me in relation to the "Ladybird" Incident.

Mr. Roberts will now proceed with the presentation of further evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Roberts.

MI.. hOBERTS: We call the witness TOTSUKA, Michitaro.

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MICHITARO T O T S U K A, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTS: Please state your name and address. Q My name, TOTSUKA, Michitaro, No. 17 Nakamachi, Nakano-ku, Tokyo. MR. KOBERTS: May the witness be shown defense document No. 1276. (Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.) Q Please examine this document and tell us whether or not it is your sworn affidavit. A This is my affidavit. MR. kOBERTS: I offer it in evidence. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1276 will receive exhibit No. 2529. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2529

and received in evidence.)

MR. ROBERTS: There is one correction on

MR. ROBERTS: There is one correction on line 3: "The Third Combined Air Corps" should be "First Combined Air Corps."

17

20

19

21 22

23

24

I read exhibit 2529.

"I was appointed Commander of the First Combined fir Corps in July 1937. The above mentioned air corps was stationed in Taihoku, Formosa, and Quelpart Island.

"On August 14, 1937, the Chinese Air Corps carried out an attack on the cruiser 'Izumo' in Shanghai Harbor as well as the Marine Headquarters. In retaliation, we bombed the Chinese Air Base in Nanking on August 15, 1937. In the early part of September 1937, the Chinese air strength was transferred southward to Conton and they bombed the cruiser 'Yubari' on the South China coast. We therefore bombed the Air Base in Canton in an attempt to wipe out the Chinese Air Force.

"Subsequently we undertook the destruction of railways and communications after receiving reports that the Chinese Army was moving northward.

"We received instruction and orders from the Third Fleet as to the objectives to be bombed. Those instructions were to bomb only airfields, arsenals, military installations, munition dumps, military schools, and other military targets. At no time did we bomb any city or town indiscriminately without a military objective in view.

20 21

16

17

18

19

22 23

"The air corps had reconnaisance planes bringing in reports and we consulted our maps for objectives to be bombed. We made use of aerial photographs
in an effort to bomb accurately.

"Of course, on occasion we did not succeed in scoring a direct hit on our targets and some unavoidable accidents occurred. At times the Chinese antiaircraft was extremely offective and we were forced to fly at high altitudes over our objectives. As soon as we bombed, we took photographs and studied the results of our bombing for the purpose of achieving greater accuracy. We never at any time intentionally bombed non-military objectives or installations. On any occasion when we failed to achieve accurate bombing and damaged some non-military installations, we were warned by the General Staff to exercise more care. I constantly instructed the pilots and commander to exercise caution in their bombing missions. On some occasions, even though we suspected the Chinese of displaying the flag of a third power, we refrained from bombing in order to be doubly sure. Giving an example here, in August 1938 when the Chinese soldiers were fleeing up the Yangtze kiver from Hankow, and just as our planes were about to bomb, a French flag was hoisted on the ship which we knew for sure they were

8

10

12

14 15

16 17

18

19

21 22

23 24

on, therefore our planes returned without bombing.

There were other cases similar in nature and although
we know the Chinese were hiding behind a foreign flag,
our men were instructed to refrain from bombing because of the possibility of being mistaken.

"In some instances of our bombing missions, we would not use the bomb sight, and resorted to the hand-operated device and a stop watch in order to make cortain of our target before releasing the bombs.

"The pilots were initially furnished maps
by the General Staff for the purpose of determining
military objectives and showing general location
of the third power installation. Made indicating
installations of the third powers based on informations
furnished directly by the third powers were distributed
later for our guidance. Therefore, it greatly aided
us in directing our attacks on enemy positions and
installations only."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDERT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, there will be no cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you want the witness excused?

MR. ROBERTS: May the witness be excused

21,377

on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly. MR. ROBERTS: We offer in evidence defense document 1131, which is a statement emanating from the Foreign Office concerning the attempt on the part of Chinese censors to manipulate dispatches of foreign correspondents and is intended to correct the distortion of facts by the Chinese censors.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, we object to document 1131. It is, we submit, a press dispatch of a kind that has been rejected on. numerous occasions by the "ribunal. It purports to say what was in a dispatch and how it was altered by the censors.

MR. ROBERTS: I think this press dispatch objection is being slightly overused by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Press release.

MR. ROBERTS: Press release.

The certificate states it to be an exact and true copy of an official document of the Japanese Foreign Office, and it states certain facts with reference to bombing of the Sincere Department Store.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Tribunal

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

MR. ROBERTS: We offer in evidence defense decument 1131, which is a statement emanating from the Foreign Office concerning the attempt on the part of Chinese censors to manipulate dispatches of foreign correspondents and is intended to correct the distortion of facts by the Chinese censors.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadior Nelan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, we object to document 1131. It is, we submit, a press dispatch of a kind that has been rejected on numerous occasions by the Tribunal. It purports to say what was in a dispatch and how it was altered by the censors.

MR. ROBERTS: It think this press dispatch objection is being slightly overused by the presecution.

THE PRESIDENT: Press release.

Mk. KOBERTS: Press release.

The certificate states it to be an exact and true copy of an efficial document of the Japanese Foreign Office, and it states certain facts with reference to bembing of the Sincere Department Store.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Tribunal

1 2

4 5

7

.

>

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22 23

24

s the objection and rejects the document.

It is too late now to take any other business

We will adjourn now until half past nine y next.

("hereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 5 May 1947, at 0930.)

upholds the objection and rejects the document.

It is too late now to take any other business today.

We will adjourn now until half past nine Monday next.

("hereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 5 May 1947, at 0930.)

upholds the objection and rejects the document.

It is too late now to take any other business today.

We will adjourn now until half past nine Menday next.

(Whoroupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 5 May 1947, at 0930.)